



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,306	12/03/2001	Erwin Reyzl	1454.1094	2570
21171	7590	09/23/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			KANG, INSUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/936,306

Applicant(s)

REYZL ET AL.

Examiner

Insun Kang

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/12/2004.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the application filed 9/12/2001.
2. As per applicant's request on the preliminary amendment, claims 1-13 have been cancelled and claims 14-25 have been added. Claims 14-25 are pending in the application.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement filed 9/12/2001 has been reviewed. All references except German Patent Application 4323787 A1 have been considered. Although the applicant stated the reference 4323787 "provides technical background for the invention," the reference fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

#### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings are objected to because: In Fig 3, there appears to be an error due to translation: Drucker, Speicher, etc are not English words. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended.

Art Unit: 2124

The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because: the title "method and arrangement for monitoring a program" is requested to change to "Program monitoring method and device" by the applicant. However, the substitute abstract contains the old title. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
6. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and

compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

The abstract does not contain sufficient and concise statements of the disclosure of the instant application. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the messages" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Only a single message is previously generated in line 5.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the system" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "the actions" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 14 recites a single action ("initiating an action")

As per claims 16-22, these claims are rejected for dependency on the above rejected parent claim 14.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "the system" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "the messages" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Only a single message is previously generated in line 5.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "the system" in line 24. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "the messages" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Only a single message is previously generated in line 6.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2124

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 14-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wygodny et al. (US Patent 6,282,701) hereinafter referred to as "Wygodny."

Per claim 14:

Wygodny discloses:

-monitoring a program distributed throughout the system ("The tracing library is configured to monitor execution of the client, and to collect trace data, based on selections in the trace options... The analyzer is preferably configured to run under the control of a multi-process operating system and to allow the developer to trace multiple threads and multiple processes," col. 3 lines 4-25; "The analyzer...and the agent...can trace a multithreaded and multi-processed client," col. 19 lines 34-45)

-checking for semantic correctness using predetermined heuristics ("The debug information ...is preferably created by a compiler when the client is compiled," col. 8 lines 21-32)

-adding an instrumentation part to the program ("The trace function involves tracing the execution of the instrumented client process and reporting certain events to BugTrapper," col. 25 lines 65-67; "Some software developers attempt to resolve the problem of monitoring the execution of an application by

[e]mbedding tracing code in the source code of the application,” col. 2 lines 11-27)

-generating a message using the instrumentation part for transmission to a monitoring process (“to generate a trace file that represents execution of the client application at the remote site...and display the trace results ...on the display screen during execution of the client program,” abstract; col. 28

Interprocess Communication section)

-initiating an action by the monitoring process (“The trace records are written to a shared memory area called the trace buffer...and from there either displayed in the BugTrapper user interface by the analyzer,” col. 29 lines 4-15)

-presenting a number of the messages as one of a list, a tree chart and a message sequence chart (“The trace tree..., in the trace tree pane...is a hierarchical tree showing trace data collected from the client,” col. 18 lines 30-44) as claimed.

Per claim 15:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further, Wygodny teaches:

-wherein the actions include at least one of:

displaying the message; intervention in execution of the program; and controlling a unit associated with the program using at least one of open and closed-loop control (“The trace records are written to a shared memory area called the trace buffer...and from there either displayed in the BugTrapper user interface by the analyzer,” col. 29 lines 4-15)



Art Unit: 2124

as claimed.

Per claim 16:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further, Wygodny teaches:

-waiting by the instrumentation part, after transmitting the message, for a response produced by the monitoring process ("The running window...allows the user...to...deselect any executables that are to be re-run from the start ...when the user does not want to attach to an executable that is already running...the user...selects a process from the list...to cause the BugTrapper to attach to the client processes and starts to collect trace data," col. 16 lines 54-67 and col. 17 lines 1-5; col. 28 Interprocess Communication section) as claimed.

Per claim 17:

The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further, Wygodny teaches:

the response is produced after one of an input by a user and an automated sequence ("The running window...allows the user...to...deselect any executables that are to be re-run from the start ...when the user does not want to attach to an executable that is already running...the user... selects a process from the list...to cause the BugTrapper to attach to the client processes and starts to collect trace data," col. 16 lines 54-67 and col. 17 lines 1-5; col. 28 Interprocess Communication section) as claimed

Per claim 18:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further, Wygodny teaches:

Art Unit: 2124

- the program is a part of a larger program (abstract) as claimed.

Per claim 19:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further, Wygodny teaches:

- a function associated with the program is instrumented (col. 18 lines 30-44) as claimed.

Per claim 20:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further, Wygodny teaches:

- middleware associated with the program is instrumented ("message passing or remote procedure calls," col. 7 lines 10-23) as claimed.

Per claim 21:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further, Wygodny teaches:

- said monitoring includes monitoring at least one of a remote procedure call, a message transmission, and a control sequence (col. 18 lines 30-44; col. 25 lines 24-40) as claimed.

Per claim 22:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and further, Wygodny teaches:

- the program is used in a technical system (col. 2 lines 28-50) as claimed.

Art Unit: 2124

Per claim 23, it is the device version of claim 14, respectively, and is rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 14 above.

Per claim 24, it is the computer readable medium version of claim 14, respectively, and is rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 14 above.

Per claim 25, it is the device version of claim 14, respectively, and is rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 14 above.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Insun Kang whose telephone number is 703-305-6465. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 703-305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IK  
9/13/2004



**ANIL KHATRI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**